

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/591,539

Applicant(s)
Nielsen et al

Examiner
Troy Arnold

Art Unit
3728

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Troy Arnold

(3) _____

(2) Ms Valerie Lund, Applicant's Authorized Agent

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 23, 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No. If yes, brief description:
A working prototype of the Applicant's invention was shown and the features demonstrated.

Claim(s) discussed: 15 and 25

Identification of prior art discussed:
Wade, US patent No. Des 359,411; Hunt, US Patent 5,072,467; Silvestri, US Patent 4,273,380.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The 112-2 rejections made in the first action after the RCE, paper no. 8, were discussed. Specifically, the Applicant's Agent requested consideration of the limitations found in the "whereby" clause in claims 15 and 25. The Examiner indicated that these limitations were given little consideration based on their functional and indefinite language, as noted in the 112-2 rejections. Specific limitations in claim 15 were discussed, the Agent and the Examiner disagreeing over whether or not the limitations were taught by base reference Wade, or whether or not modification to Wade would have been obvious and desirable. The Agent requested consideration of newly proposed amendments. The Examiner declined to consider the newly proposed amendments, requesting that the Applicant instead submit a formal written response to the outstanding action, paper no. 8. The arguments listed 1-5 made by the Attorney of Record in paper no. 7 were discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required